



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

March 2, 2005

Ms. Caroline Kelley
Assistant City Attorney
City of Missouri City
1522 Texas Parkway
Missouri City, Texas 77489

OR2005-01791

Dear Ms. Kelley:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 219754.

The City of Missouri City (the "city") received a request for information related to a particular investigation. You state that some of the requested information has been released to the requestor but claim that the remaining information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

First, we address your claim under section 552.101 of the Government Code with respect to the marked information contained in the document submitted as Exhibit B. Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This section encompasses information protected by other statutes, including the Medical Practice Act (the "MPA"), subtitle B of title 3 of the Occupations Code. Section 159.002 of the MPA provides in relevant part:

(b) A record of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that is created or maintained by a physician is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.

(c) A person who receives information from a confidential communication or record as described by this chapter, other than a person listed in Section 159.004 who is acting on the patient's behalf, may not disclose the information except to the extent that disclosure is consistent with the authorized purposes for which the information was first obtained.

Occ. Code § 159.002(b), (c). Information that is subject to section 159.002 confidentiality includes both medical records and information obtained from those medical records. *See* Occ. Code §§ 159.002, .004; Open Records Decision No. 598 (1991). Medical records must be released upon a patient's signed, written consent, provided that the consent specifies (1) the information to be covered by the release; (2) reasons or purposes for the release; and (3) the person to whom the information is to be released. Occ. Code §§ 159.004, .005. Section 159.002(c) also requires that any subsequent release of medical records be consistent with the purposes for which the governmental body obtained the records. Open Records Decision No. 565 at 7 (1990).

Medical records may be released only as provided under the MPA. Open Records Decision No. 598 (1991). You inform us that the marked information in Exhibit B was "obtained from medical records created by physicians" Based on your representations and our review of the submitted information, we agree that the information we have marked in Exhibit B may only be disclosed in accordance with chapter 159 of the Occupations Code.

We now turn to your claim under section 552.108 of the Government Code with respect to the video tape submitted as Exhibit C. Section 552.108(a) excepts from disclosure "[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime . . . if: (1) release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime." A governmental body claiming an exception to disclosure under section 552.108 must reasonably explain how and why section 552.108 is applicable to that information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). You state that the requested video tape relates to a pending criminal proceeding and assert that its release would interfere with the investigation and prosecution of this crime. Based upon this representation, we conclude that the release of the video tape would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See Houston Chronicle Publ'g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases). Accordingly, the video tape is subject to section 552.108 and may be withheld on this basis.

In summary: (1) the marked information contained in Exhibit B may only be released in accordance with the MPA; and (2) the city may withhold the video tape pursuant to

section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Tex. Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code

§ 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "RBR/krl", written in a cursive style.

Robert B. Rapfogel
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

RBR/krl

Ref: ID# 219754

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Rhonda Johnson
1219 Beechbend Drive
Missouri City, Texas 77489
(w/o enclosures)